

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/701,051	11/04/2003	Chun-Fai Cheng	SMBZ 2 00980	5563
27885	7590 09/22/2006		EXAMINER	
FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP 1100 SUPERIOR AVENUE, SEVENTH FLOOR			PIZIALI, JEFFREY J	
CLEVELAND	•	rLOOK	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	
		DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/701,051	CHENG, CHUN-FAI			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Jeff Piziali	2629			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
2a) <u></u>	<ol> <li>Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 November 2003</u>.</li> <li>This action is <b>FINAL</b>. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.</li> <li>Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</li> </ol>					
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
5) □ 6) □ 7) □ 8) ⊠ <b>Applicati</b> 9) □ 10) ⊠	Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) 1-12 are subject to restriction and/or estimate of the specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on 04 November 2003 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner Confidence of the oath	vn from consideration. election requirement. r. re: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected and accepted in abeyance. See too is required if the drawing(s) is objected in the drawing(s) is objecte	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
		arminer. Note the attached Office	Action of form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some colon None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Inforr	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 2/9/2004.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te			

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

1. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

Species I, drawn to a gray scale reference voltage generator comprising two-time dependent voltage feedback controlled current sources (see Page 8, Line 15 - Page 9, Line 6 of the instant specification, for instance), and

**Species II**, drawn to a gray scale reference voltage generator comprising two constant (time-independent) current sources (see Page 9, Lines 8-12 of the instant specification, for instance).

The species are independent or distinct because the species do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the species are not obvious variants; and the species each have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, and effect.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-5, 9, 10, and 12 appear to be generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable

thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

2. A telephone call was made to James W. McKee (Registration Number 26,482) on 15

September 2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 2629

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-7678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (6:30AM - 3PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (571) 272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeff Piziali

15 September 2006

reali